

II. REMARKS AND ELECTION OF INVENTION

This is in response to the Office Action mailed November 29, 2004, the period in which to respond has been extended to and including January 29, 2005, by the accompanying petition for a retroactive one-month extension of time. In the subject Office Action, the Examiner raised a five-way species restriction, asserting that the following five patentably distinct embodiments were illustrated in the Figures:

Group I - Figures 8 and 9;

Group II - Figure 21;

Group III - Figure 29;

Group IV - Figures 16-20 and 25-28; and,

Group V - Figures 10-15.

The Examiner also asserted that no claim was generic.

Applicants first will traverse and object to the species restriction, for it is clear that the Examiner raised certain aspects thereof in error. Applicants understand that the first manner of examination of an application is to review the Figures, but earnestly believe that in order for such a review not to be a cursory review, the Examiner is at least mandated to review the claims pending in the application, especially in light of the fact that the present application is a divisional application of a parent application, having the same examiner. In the parent application, the exact same restriction requirement was raised and applicants prosecuted claims directed to a specific structure of a connector with a flexible body portion, which were described in FIGS 8 & 9 and others.

The Examiner next asserts that FIG. 21. shows a separate invention, but that Figure is directed to another variant of Group I. The Examiner further asserts that Figures 16-20 and 25-28 illustrate a Group III invention. Those Figures illustrate, in Figures 16-19C thereof, ways in which the holes and contacts are formed, and Figures 25-28 thereof illustrate alternate styles of punching tools used to form holes in the connector body portions. However, no claims in the pending application are directed toward these elements, so how can they constitute a patentably distinct species? That is an issue for the a copending application.

Figure 21 (Group IV) illustrates the use of a film member as the reinforcing member for the body portion, while Figure 29 (Group V) illustrates the use of a single film member as the body portion with stitched contacts.

Obviously, the Examiner has misunderstood the application and perhaps forgotten to read the pending claims. If the claims filed with this application were read, the species restriction requirement should have been properly raised as a three-way restriction on the pending claims with the first species or group directed to a connector with a flexible body portion that supports dual strand contacts that provide redundant and low-inductance circuit paths for each contact, the second species or group being a connector with a frame that supports a flexible body portion by means of anchor cavities that are formed in the connector frame, and the third species or group directed to a connector in which the contacts are stitched into place in a body portion of the connector..

Applicants assert that the restriction requirement raised by the Examiner in the subject Office action is erroneous. Based upon the claims which are pending in this application, there are only three patentably distinct species or groups of inventions:

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| Species I | a connector with a flexible body portion that supports dual strand contacts that provide redundant and low-inductance circuit paths for each contact as shown in FIGS. 1-2A, 7-7D, 10-23; |
| Species II | a connector with a frame having anchor cavities that cooperate to support a body portion of the connector as shown in FIGS. 3-7A; and, |
| Species III | a connector having a body portion that supports conductive contacts in which the contacts are stitched in place within the body portion. |

Election of Invention

Applicants hereby elect, with traverse, the first species illustrated in FIGS. 1-2A, 7-7D, 10-23 which show a connector with a flexible body portion that supports dual strand contacts that provide redundant and low-inductance circuit paths for each contact. The claims which read upon this species are claims 25-42 and 66-69.

By the present amendment, applicants have cancelled, without prejudice, claims 43-47 and 62-65

Acknowledgement of Consideration of Prior Art Submitted in the Parent Application

The Examiner is hereby respectfully requested to acknowledge in the next Office Action, that he has considered the prior art submitted by applicants in the parent application in accordance with MPEP §2001.06(b).

Respectfully submitted,

MOLEX INCORPORATED



Thomas D. Paulius

Reg. No. 30,792

January 13, 2005
2222 Wellington Court
Lisle, Illinois 60532
(630)-527-4897